



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,362	08/26/2005	Simon Powell	PBT.P0006	3644
7590 Edward G Greive Renner Kenner Greive Bobak Taylor & Weber Fourth Floor First National Tower Akron, OH 44308-1456			EXAMINER LEE, CLOUD K	
			ART UNIT 3753	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/12/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/530,362

**Applicant(s)**

POWELL, SIMON

**Examiner**

CLOUD K. LEE

**Art Unit**

3753

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/ISD)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/11/05 6/14/07

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the O-ring (claim 6) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 3753

2. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is vague and indefinite as to what is meant by “the blade is shaped so as to provide the desired stiffness” in claim 2. What is the shape of the blade can provide the desired stiffness and what the definition of “desired” stiffness? One of ordinary skill in the art would not be apprised of the metes and bounds of the limitation “shaped so as to provide the desired stiffness”.

It is vague and indefinite as to what is meant by “loosely mounted” in claim 3. What is the definition of “loosely mounted” in the claim? How “loosely” is being considered as “loosely mounted”? One of ordinary skill in the art would not be apprised of the metes and bounds of the limitation “loosely mounted” in claim 3.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-3 (as understood) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Baldwin et al. (US Patent No. 5,139,226).

Baldwin et al. discloses a valve comprising a body (71, see figure 10), a fluid passageway having an inlet (73), an outlet (77). A valve member (98) for inhibiting fluid flow through the passageway, means (83) for moving the valve member (98) for controlling the flow of fluid from

Art Unit: 3753

the inlet to the outlet. The valve member is in the form of a flexible blade (see figure 12), one end of the flexible blade is mounted at a location remote from the passageway (see figure 1, near 93). The means of moving (83) the valve member is arranged to act on the other end of the blade (see figure 10). A sealing member (the periphery of the inlet, see element 78 that is contact with 98) is provided around the periphery of the inlet (73) and the blade has a degree of stiffness such that it provides a fuse tending to keep the blade in contact with the sealing member.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baldwin et al (US Patent No. 5,139,226) in view of Lee et al. (US Patent No. 4,492,360).

Baldwin et al fails to disclose an auxiliary member is located over the flexible blade, wherein the auxiliary member is in the form of a blade.

Lee et al. discloses an auxiliary member (42) is located over the flexible blade (38), wherein the auxiliary member is in the form of a blade (auxiliary member 42 is same shape as the flexible member/blade 38) for providing a limit arm or leaf spring for limiting the downward or opening displacement of the valve member. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided an auxiliary member

is located over the flexible blade, wherein the auxiliary member is in the form of a blade in order to limit the downward or opening displacement of the valve member as taught by Lee et al.

7. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baldwin et al in view of Lee (US Patent No. 4,492,360) as applied in claims 4-5, and further in view of Tsai (US Patent No. 5,785,295).

The combination of Baldwin and Lee fails to disclose the sealing member is an O-ring.

Tsai discloses a sealing member (321) is an O-ring for sealing the inlet. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided a sealing O-ring in order to seal the passageway between the inlet and the outlet.

### *Conclusion*

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Nestler et al (US Patent No. 5,040,567).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CLOUD K. LEE whose telephone number is (571)272-7206. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Huson can be reached on (571)272-4887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3753

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen M. Hepperle/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3753

CL